

ROMAN,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	CA. NO. 16-299 Erie
)	
v.)	
)	
)	ORDER ADOPTING REPORT
)	AND RECOMMENDATION
)	
WETZEL, et al.,)	
)	
<i>Defendants.</i>)	
)	

The Court, having reviewed Plaintiff Anibal Roman’s motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order (Dkt. No. 4), the oral Report and Recommendation of the Honorable Susan P. Baxter, United States Magistrate Judge, (Dkt. Nos. 11 and 13), and the balance of the record, does hereby find that:

1

1 medical doctor and a psychiatrist;

2 (2) Plaintiff further alleges that he fears that “he is one assault away in losing his
3 (kidney transplant) or even worse death.” Dkt. No. 4 at ¶ 3 (parentheticals in
4 original). Therefore, he requests that the Court order that Plaintiff be placed on
5 Single Cell Status (Medical Z Code under DC-ADM-006);

6 (3) The Magistrate Judge concluded in the Report and Recommendation that Plaintiff
7 failed to demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits or that he is likely to face
8 irreparable harm in the absence of an injunction. In reaching her decision, she noted
9 that it has been over seventeen years since Plaintiff received his kidney transplant
10 and nearly two years since Plaintiff was assaulted and attempted suicide. The
11 Magistrate Judge further noted that Plaintiff is currently housed on the Special
12 Needs Unit and is being followed by both a medical doctor and a psychiatrist for
13 his medical concerns. Therefore, the Magistrate Judge concluded that Plaintiff
14 failed to demonstrate a real or immediate danger of irreparable harm.
15

16 (4) This Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation
17 and nothing in the Objections persuades this Court that the Report and
18 Recommendation should not be adopted. Plaintiff simply reasserts his fear that he
19 is “one assault away in losing his [Kidney Transplant] or even worse death.” Dkt.
20 No. 14 at ¶ 3 (brackets in original). While the Court is sympathetic with Plaintiff’s
21 concern, he has not presented any evidence that he is in imminent danger of harm.
22 *See McCahon v. Pennsylvania Turnpike Com’n*, 491 F. Supp. 2d 522, 527 (stating
23 that “the moving party must establish that the harm is imminent and probable”). It
24 is not enough for Plaintiff to claim that he is at risk of irreparable harm; he must
25

1 demonstrate that the risk is “immediate.” *ECRI v. McGraw-Hill, Inc.*, 809 F.2d 223,
2 226 (3d Cir. 1987); *Continental Group, Inc. v. Amoco Chemicals Corp.*, 614 F.2d
3 351, 359 (3d Cir. 1980) (risk of irreparable harm means clear showing of immediate
4 irreparable injury or presently existing actual threat); *Bieros v. Nicola*, 857 F. Supp.
5 445, 446 (E.D. Penn. 1994) (same). Plaintiff has presented no such evidence. He
6 admits that the last time he was assaulted was a year and a half ago and he presents
7 no evidence that suggests a current increased risk of harm.
8

9 (5) Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation; and

10 (6) The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to send copies of this Order to
11 Plaintiff, Defendants, and to Judge Baxter.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 DATED this 9th day of June, 2017.
14
15

16 
17

18 _____
19 BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25